

Appl. No. 10/804,758  
Amdt. dated Mar. 7, 2008  
Reply to Office action of Dec. 7, 2007

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
MAR 07 2008

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants sincerely appreciate the courtesy extended by Examiner Zanelli during the interview conducted on February 19, 2008. Pursuant to the discussion at the interview, claim 14, the only remaining independent apparatus claim, has been amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112(1). The claim 14 features and their corresponding support in the original specification are identified in Attachment A submitted herewith.

In response to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112(2), and pursuant to the Examiner's suggestions in the outstanding Office action, claims 14 and 16 have been amended.

Method claim 21 has been amended to include the method steps corresponding to the features of apparatus claim 14.

Also pursuant to the discussion during the interview, the remaining independent claims 14 and 21 patentably distinguish over the prior art references of record. The remarks included in the amendment filed on October 31, 2007 regarding such distinctions are incorporated herein by reference. All of the remaining claims depend directly or indirectly from claim 14.

Based on the foregoing, the application is in condition for allowance and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if prosecution of this application can be expedited thereby.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees and credit any excess payments to Deposit Account No. 50-3424.

### Substance of the February 19, 2008 Interview

1. No exhibits were shown or demonstrations conducted.
2. Claims 14 and 21 were discussed.
3. The prior art of record was discussed.

Appl. No. 10/804,758  
Amdt. dated Mar. 7, 2008  
Reply to Office action of Dec. 7, 2007

4. The principle proposed amendments of a substantive nature are reflected in the accompanying amendments to the claims.
5. The general thrust of the principal arguments was that the proposed amendments overcome the rejections under 35 U.S. C. §§ 112 (1) and (2). Moreover, based on remarks submitted on October 31, 2007, the remaining independent claims 14 and 21 patentably distinguish over the prior art references of record.
6. No other pertinent matters were discussed.
7. The general results or outcome of the interview was that the proposed amendments place the claims in condition for allowance.

I hereby certify that this paper is being filed by  
facsimile transmission (571-273-8300) with the  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

Date of fax transmission: March 7, 2008

Mark E. Brown  
Mark E. Brown, Reg. No. 30,361

Respectfully Submitted,

Mark E. Brown

Mark E. Brown

Reg. No. 30,361

LAW OFFICE OF MARK BROWN, LLC

4700 Belleview, Suite 210

Kansas City, Missouri 64112

Telephone: (816) 268-8950

Attorney for Applicant

Appl. No. 10/804,758  
Amdt. dated Mar. 7, 2008  
Reply to Office action of Dec. 7, 2007

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 07 2008

**ATTACHMENT A**

**Overcoming 35 U.S.C. § 112 (1) objection:**

Rejection: GNSS attitude subsystem for computing reference attitude angles and a function for calibrating bias and scale factor errors in a yaw gyroscope using computed reference angles not clearly described in original application.

<b>Claim 14 (As Currently Amended)</b>	<b>Original Specification Support</b>
GNSS attitude subsystem computing vehicle position and attitude	[0017] ... The sensor system utilizes a plurality of GPS carrier phase differenced antennas to derive attitude information.
Means for reducing bias and drift errors in the yaw gyroscope using said vehicle attitude	[0020] Another benefit is that achieved by incorporating a GPS-based heading sensor is the elimination or reduction of drift and biases resultant from a gyro-only or other inertial sensor approach. ...
Means for automatically calibrating said steering control commands using GNSS-derived vehicle position	[0041] ... The sensor system 20 measures response of the vehicle 10 as depicted at process block 350 and calculates the response times and characteristics for the vehicle. For example, a selected command is applied and the proportionality of the turn measured given the selected change in steering. Turning to process block 360, the responses of the vehicle are then used to calibrate the control commands applying a modified control command to achieve a

Appl. No. 10/804,758  
Amdt. dated Mar. 7, 2008  
Reply to Office action of Dec. 7, 2007

	<p>desired response. It will be appreciated that such an auto-calibration feature would possibly be limited by constraints of the vehicle to avoid excess stress or damage as depicted at 370.</p> <p>Method flowchart Fig. 6 shows calibration step 360.</p>
--	---

**Overcoming 35 U.S.C. § 112 (2) objection:**

Claim 14 is amended to state that the steering control subsystem is connected to the yaw gyroscope. The yaw gyroscope output can thus be used as claimed.